



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/657,597 | 09/08/2003 | Warren A. Ceroll | 275A-154/DVH | 1116 |
| 27572 | 7590 | 04/14/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 | | | PETERSON, KENNETH E | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 3724 | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/657,597 | CEROLL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kenneth E Peterson | 3724 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 124-144 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 124-144 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 124-144 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett et al.'510, who shows a table saw with most of the recited limitations including 1st and 2nd stationary rails (34,36), 1st and 2nd movable rails (58,60) and a fence (146) that is movable beyond the end of the stationary rails as seen in figure 8.

Bartlett lacks a movable rail alignment system. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known for tables having fences to employ a pulley and cable alignment system utilizing four corner pulleys and two cables attached to opposing ends of movable rails. Examples of such are the patents to Waters '006 and Jean '294. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided Bartlett with such a pulley and cable alignment system, as is well known and taught by Waters and Jean, in order to keep the movable rails moving together and thus keep the fence straight.

In regards to at least claims 126,127 and 140, Bartlett's movable rails (58,60) are inside the stationary rails, as opposed to being "disposed over" the stationary rails. However, having the movable rail be inside or outside the stationary rail is a simple reversal of parts that would be obvious to one of ordinary skill. Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known for the movable rail to be disposed over the stationary rail. An example of this is shown by Bartlett himself, where movable rail 90

slide over fixable rail 60. Another example is the patent to Haas et al.'687. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have further modified Bartlett by having the movable rail be disposed over the stationary rail, as is well known and taught by Hass and Bartlett himself, the this is a simple reversal of parts that not alter the operation of the machine.

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
Applicant has overcome the rejections under 35 USC 102.
Applicant argues that Bartlett does not teach the positioning of the fence beyond the end of the table. It is not understood why Applicant made this argument. Please see Bartlett's figure 8.
Applicant should note that his fence has a wider range of motion than does Bartlett's, but this feature is not currently claimed.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson at 571-272-4512, on Monday-Thursday, 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached at 571-272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that papers be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or call the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp
April 11, 2005


KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER